

Subject: Tuna Canyon Detention Station-Cultural Historical Monument # 1039

From: "James M Okazaki" <jokazaki@sbcglobal.net>

Date: 1/14/18, 6:14 PM

To: Nancy Oda; juneaochiberk@me.comnt; Claudia Culling; Russell Endo; Marc Stirdivant; Sigrid Toye; Kanji Sahara; Lloyd Hitt; Nancy Takayama; Bill Skiles; Kay Oda; Ellen Endo; Karen K. Zimmerman

Hi All,

I wanted to address an issue that the Partnership has claimed as one of their "honorable" reason for looking for the off-site location, across the street south of La Tuna Canyon Road, next to the 210 Freeway, The Petition and the Rafu article states that...."the challenge is that this location (ON-SITE) is in a proposed private gated housing development, which will have no access to the public." But, as the attached Exhibit A to Council File 12-1625 (which was adopted in June 25, 1013) shows, the City Council ASKED for and fully intended that there be the Public Access on La Tuna Canyon Road. The Motion instructs City Planning to convene the Historic Tuna Canyon Detention Station Working Group to...."explore appropriate ways to commemorate the historical and cultural significance of the site and strategies to secure resources to support the development of appropriate ON-SITE interpretive displays, signage, markers and/or exhibits; and present its findings and recommendations to the City Council within 60 days." Also, the Summary Report of the Working Group (9/10/13) summarizes the three meetings that we participated with City Planning and the developer, and the developer's plan, which they submitted to us shows parking spaces off La Tuna Canyon, so they also provided the ON-SITE public access desired by City Council. Unfortunately, as the report points out that at the last meeting, the developer's representative announced their intent to file a law suit, and no further discussions pursued. So, as far as the City Council and the Tuna Canyon Detention Coalition is aware of, there has always been a planned public access to this site. I don't think I have seen a new plan that prohibits public access, and if the developer is planning to do such, I believe it goes against the City Council Motion, don't you all agree?

James Okazaki

attachments, Original Council Motion an Working Group Summary Report



- [Attachments-176/Summary Report of Working Group.pdf](#)
- [Attachments-176/Council Motion for HCM #1039 on 6_25_13.pdf](#)